UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,550	01/25/2002	Richard E. Michaelson	29757/P-570	8841

4743 7590 05/25/2007

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300
SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
YOO, JASSON H	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3714	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/056,550	MICHAELSON, RICHARD E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jasson H. Yoo	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 April 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,14-21,34-39 and 41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,14-21,34-39 and 41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/3/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 14, 16, 17, 19, 34, 36, 39, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims recite the limitation of "detecting a fee at a plurality of intervals from the value total during a gaming session". The specification does not describe the limitation of "a gaming session".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 16, 19, 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3, 16, 19, 36, recite the limitation of interrupting for a period of time the detecting of a plurality of intervals from the value total during a gaming session independent of play of said game represented by the said video image. It is not clear what is independent of play of the game. The claim does not specify if the interruption, the deduction of a plurality of intervals, or the gaming session is independent of play of the game. For purposes of examination, the claim will read, as the interval is independent of the play of the game represent by video image.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 14-20, 34-37, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (U.S. 6,077,163).

Claims 1, 14, 17, 34; Walker discloses a gaming method comprising:

Receiving a value amount to initially define a value total (Abstract, Figs. 2B, 5, 8A-B, 11A, 15, column 2, lines 1-5, and column 3, lines 25-30);

Causing a video image representing a game to be generated, said video image representing one of the following games: video poker, video blackjack, video slots, video keno and video bingo, said video image comprising an image of at least five playing cards if said game comprises video poker, said video image comprising an image of a plurality of simulated slot machine reels if said game comprises video slots, said video image comprising an image of a plurality of keno numbers if said game comprises video keno, and said video image comprising an image of a bingo grid if said game comprises video bingo (Column 3, lines 1-5);

deducting a fee at a plurality of intervals from the value total during a gaming session (The player selects a fee for a gaming session/flat pay session, cols. 10:24-31, 11:58-62. Fees are deducted on intervals based on the flat pay rate or the rate of the gaming session. During the gaming session, a fee is deducted at intervals in a form of a countdown, cols. 6:36-38, 12:31-60, 13:18-50. The gaming session ends when the balance for the gaming session reaches zero. More specifically, the gaming session ends when the countdown of the interval remaining and the value of interval remaining reach zero, cols. 6:36-39, 12:43-44, 13:18-42), the intervals being independent of play of said game represented by said video image and independent of input from a player (The intervals of the flat pay session is independent of the game and input from a player, cols. 1:62-65, 2:1-5, 3:25-30, 11:51-57, 13:27-42);

determining based on the fee a value payout associated with an outcome of said game represented by said video image [(Figs. 6, 8A-B, and column 6, line 56-column 12, line 21) Based on the flat rate fee that is calculated the number of coins bet per play a pay combination jackpot is established as shown in figure 6 for example.]; and

adding the value to the value total (Fig. 13, Column 3, lines 25-30, and column 4, lines 27-35).

Claims 2, 15, and 35; Walker discloses deducting a fixed fee periodically from the value total independent of play of said game represented by said video image (Abstract, Figs. 2B, 5, 8A-B, 11A, 15, column 2, lines 1-5, and column 3, lines 25-30); A flat rate fee is deducted at each player session.

Claims 3, 16, 19, and 36; Walker discloses interrupting for a period of time the deducting of a plurality of intervals from the value total during a gaming session independent of play of said game represented by said video game (The countdown is stopped when the when the gaming session is not active, col. 12:25-60, 13:5-17. When the count down is not implemented, the deduction of a plurality of intervals from the value total is interrupted, col. 12:25-60).

Claims 20 and 37; Walker discloses the gaming apparatuses being interconnected to form a network of gaming apparatuses (Fig. 1, 3, and column 3, line 40-column 4, line 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (U.S. 6,077,163) in view of Lott (5,851,011).

Claims 21 and 38, as discussed above, Walker discloses the gaming devices are connected to a network. However, Walker does not specifically teach the gaming devices are interconnected via the Internet. In an analogous art to operating gaming machines connected to a network, Lott teaches a gaming machine connected to a network and the Internet. Many video based casino games are offered over the Internet, thereby making the games available to a potentially enormous audience (col. 3:52-54). The games offered over the Internet allow players to interact with each other (share jackpot, cols. 7:32-39, 13:7-33). The operator, or casino management system could further monitor all monetary exchanges between the remote gaming machines and the player (cols. 14:66 - 15:10). Therefore it would have been obvious in one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Walker's gaming device connected to a network, and incorporate the network to include the Internet, in order to

offer a large numbers of players to play the game while managing and monitoring all monetary exchanges between the gaming machines and players.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/3/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 14, 17, 24, 39 and 41, Applicant argues that Walker does not teach deducting a fee at a plurality of intervals from the value total during a gaming session. However, Walker teaches the player selects a fee for a gaming session/flat pay session (cols. 10:24-31, 11:58-62). The fees are deducted on intervals based on the flat pay rate or the rate of the gaming session. During the gaming session, a fee is deducted at intervals in a form of a countdown (cols. 6:36-38, 12:31-60, 13:18-50). The gaming session ends when the balance for the gaming session reaches zero. More specifically, the gaming session ends when the countdown of the interval remaining and the value of interval remaining reach zero, cols. (6:36-39, 12:43-44, 13:18-42).

Furthermore, as noted in the previous Office Action (dated 10/3/06), changing the time intervals at does not patentably distinguish over Walker. Walker discloses a fee deduction based on time and the length of time as a whole. Walker further discloses the fee is credited if the whole length of time is not used up. Regardless of the change in number of increments or the change in length of increments, the end result or the length in time as a whole is still the same. For example, Walker discloses a fee of $25 for half an hour of play (col. 3:28-30). The half an hour of play for $25 is equivalent to

buying six 5-minute blocks of a flat rate playing time totaling the fee of $25. Applicant has not provided any arguments why such modification is beneficial or patentably distinguishable. Therefore Applicant's claimed invention is equivalent to Walker, and does not overcome the prior art taught by Walker.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant argues that Walker does not teach interrupting for a period of time the deducting of a fee at a plurality of intervals from the value total. However, as indicated above, Walker teaches the countdown is stopped when the when the gaming session is not active (col. 12:25-60, 13:5-17). When the count down is not implemented, the deduction of a plurality of intervals from the value total is interrupted (col. 12:25-60).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jasson H. Yoo whose telephone number is (571)272-5563. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571)272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JHY

/Corbett Coburn/
Primary Examiner
AU 3714